

Measuring anomalous “spin” in elastic ep or νp and deep inelastic ep scattering

S.D. Bass^{a,1}, R.J. Crewther^{b,c,2}, F.M. Steffens^{c,d,3}, A.W. Thomas^{c,4}

^a *Institut für Theoretische Kernphysik, Universität Bonn,
Nussallee 14-16, D-53115 Bonn, Germany*

^b *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Bern,
Sidlerstrasse 5, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland*

^c *Department of Physics and Mathematical Physics and
Centre for the Subatomic Structure of Matter,
University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia*

^d *Instituto de Física da Universidade de São Paulo,
P.O. Box 66318, São Paulo 05315 970, SP, Brazil*

Abstract

We obtain a general rule that the $O(1/\log m_h)$ term due to the current $\bar{h}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h$ of a mass- m_h quark h in f -flavour theory is $-3\bar{g}_f^2(m_h)/\{2\pi^2(33-2f)\}$ times the flavour singlet current of the residual $(f-1)$ -flavour theory, where $\bar{g}_f$ is the f -flavour running coupling constant in a mass-independent renormalization scheme. The rule is applied to the Ellis-Jaffe moment below and well above charm threshold, and to low-energy Z^0 -exchange amplitudes. The singlet axial charge of the proton common to these experiments is both scale and gauge invariant, but is related to the axial anomaly and the “gluon spin” by a non-perturbative renormalization factor.

¹sbass@pythia.itkp.uni-bonn.de

²Leave of absence from the University of Adelaide ends February 5, 1997.
rcrewthe@physics.adelaide.edu.au, crewther@butp.unibe.ch

³fsteffen@finpe.if.usp.br

⁴athomas@physics.adelaide.edu.au

With major experiments underway to determine the strange-quark contributions to polarised deep inelastic scattering and low-energy parity-violating elastic ep and νp scattering, it is vital to understand precisely what will be learnt. At first sight, the answer seems clear: throw away contributions from heavy quarks, including charm, and identify the remaining flavour singlet and non-singlet contributions to axial charges of the proton in the various reactions.

However the situation in QCD is far from obvious because of renormalization effects in the singlet channel [1, 2, 3] associated with the axial anomaly [4, 5]. In separate studies of the deep inelastic [6] and elastic neutral current [7] processes mentioned above, it has been noted that these effects give rise to a characteristic factor⁵

$$E(g) = \exp \int_0^g dg' \gamma(g')/\beta(g') \quad (1)$$

multiplying the gauge-invariantly renormalized singlet axial-vector operator

$$J_{\mu 5}^{GI} = \left(\bar{u} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 u + \bar{d} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 d + \bar{s} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 s \right)_{GI} \quad (2)$$

in the residual theory (only three flavours u, d, s if c, b, t are considered heavy). Here $\beta(g)$ and $\gamma(g)$ are the Callan-Symanzik functions of the residual theory associated with the gluon coupling constant g and the composite operator $J_{\mu 5}^{GI}$. We note that the factor (1) is non-perturbative: it involves integration over a finite range from 0 to a value g defined at a renormalization point μ well below the charm threshold.

Our aim is to pin down the relation between the axial proton charges which arise in these inelastic and elastic processes, while taking full account of complications such as the factor (1). This turns out to be possible for leading terms in the heavy-quark expansion

$$m_t, m_b, m_c \longrightarrow \infty, \quad m_t \gg m_b \gg m_c \quad (3)$$

and includes a simple rule for the $O(1/\log m_h)$ correction as each quark $h = t, b$, or c is made infinitely heavy. For the inelastic process, two limits are considered:

- (a) Asymptotia below charm threshold, defined by

$$m_t \gg m_b \gg m_c \gg Q \gg \mu \quad (4)$$

where μ is the renormalization subtraction point, i.e. all heavy quark limits, including $m_c \rightarrow \infty$, are taken *before* the limit $Q = \sqrt{-q^2} \rightarrow \infty$ of large space-like momentum transfer q_μ .

- (b) At the end of the paper, asymptotia well above charm threshold, but below bottom threshold, *viz.*

$$m_t \gg m_b \gg Q \gg m_c \gg \mu \quad (5)$$

⁵Many earlier papers, from [1] or [3] onwards, make implicit reference to this factor but then either omit it or keep only the leading order in the exponent. The lower limit of integration in equation (9) of [8] is missing; presumably 0 was intended. We follow the convention of [3] for $\gamma(g)$, i.e. the two-loop term is positive.

We begin with inelastic polarized ep scattering in the limit (4), the residual theory being QCD with three flavours u, d, s . According to (4), asymptotia for a structure function W is the deep inelastic limit $Q \rightarrow \infty$ taken *after* the limit (3),

$$W(x, \infty) = \lim_{Q \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\text{eq (3)}} W(x, Q^2) \Big|_{6 \text{ flavours}} \quad (6)$$

where $x = Q^2/2p \cdot q$ is Bjorken's variable. This means that the relevant deep inelastic data from which a three-flavour singlet charge is to be extracted should be restricted to kinematic regions below the charm threshold ($\Lambda_c D$ production):

$$Q^2(1-x)/x < (m_D + m_{\Lambda_c})^2 - m_p^2 \quad (7)$$

Small violations of this condition may be acceptable, provided that all charm threshold effects are isolated [9] and removed.

Let $\bar{g} = \bar{g}(Q)$ be the effective coupling constant of the three-flavour theory,

$$\log(Q/\mu) = \int_g^{\bar{g}} dg' / \beta(g') \quad (8)$$

and let $g_A^0|_{\text{inv}}$ be the axial charge of the operator [6, 8]

$$\mathcal{S}_\mu(x) = E(g) J_{\mu 5}^{GI}(x) \quad (9)$$

for proton states $|p, s\rangle$ with momentum p_μ and spin s_μ :

$$\langle p, s | \mathcal{S}_\mu(0) | p, s \rangle = 2m_p s_\mu g_A^0|_{\text{inv}} \quad (10)$$

Then, as Q tends to ∞ , the $SU(3)$ flavour singlet part of the Ellis-Jaffe moment [10] is given by [3, 6, 8, 11, 12]

$$\int_0^1 dx g_1(x, Q^2) \Big|_{\text{singlet}} \sim \frac{1}{9} g_A^0|_{\text{inv}} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{\ell \geq 1} c_\ell \bar{g}^{2\ell}(Q) \right\} \quad (11)$$

where the coefficient c_ℓ is calculable in ℓ -loop perturbation theory [8].

The factor $E(g)$ in (9) arises naturally from the coefficient function of $J_{\mu 5}^{GI}$ in the product of electromagnetic currents $J_\alpha(x) J_\beta(0)$ at short distances $x_\mu \sim 0$. It compensates for the scale dependence of $J_{\mu 5}^{GI}$ caused by the anomaly in its divergence⁶,

$$\partial^\mu J_{\mu 5}^{GI} = 2f \partial^\mu K_\mu + \sum_{i=1}^f 2im_i \bar{q}_i \gamma_5 q_i \quad (12)$$

where K_μ is a renormalized version of the gluonic Chern-Simons current, and the number of flavours f is 3.

⁶As Adler noted in his original paper [4], the anomaly gives rise to a multiplicative factor Z_5 which makes $J_{\mu 5}^{GI}$ finite at two-loop level and beyond. The corresponding $\gamma(g)$ function was introduced by Köberle and Nielsen [14] in quantum electrodynamics (before asymptotic freedom). The extension to QCD was discussed in the review [15] and independently in [1]. There followed Kodaira's well-known application [3] to polarised deep inelastic scattering.

A consequence of the renormalization-scale invariance of $\mathcal{S}_\mu$ is that its spatial components have operator charges

$$S_i(t) = \int d^3x \mathcal{S}^i(t, \mathbf{x}) \quad (13)$$

which satisfy an equal-time algebra [6]

$$[S_i(t), S_j(t)] = i\varepsilon_{ijk} S_k(t) \quad (14)$$

characteristic of spin operators. Unfortunately, the time dependence of the “spin” S_i implies that energy eigenstates such as $|p, s\rangle$ are complicated mixtures of its representations. Note that a proposal [16] to obtain the $U(6) \times U(6)$ algebra [17] in QCD works only if the singlet axial-vector operator is identified as $\mathcal{S}_\mu$.

As noted above, the factor (1) is not perturbative, and so should *not* be approximated by retaining just the lowest-order terms in β and γ . We also note that, although the divergence of $\mathcal{S}_\mu$ is

$$\partial^\mu \mathcal{S}_\mu = 6E(g)\partial^\mu K_\mu + \text{mass terms} \quad (15)$$

the quantity $E(g)\partial^\mu K_\mu$ is not scale invariant (contrary to [12]) because K_μ is not multiplicatively renormalized⁷: its counterterms are all proportional to $J_{\mu 5}^{GI}$. As a result, in the relation between the observed singlet charge $g_A^0|_{\text{inv}}$, the “gluon spin” Δg [18, 19] as interpreted in the light-front gauge [20], and the scale invariant contribution $\Delta\Sigma_{\text{cons}}$ from the gauge dependent, partially conserved chiral current, $E(g)$ appears as an uncontrolled theoretical factor:⁸

$$g_A^0|_{\text{inv}} = E(g) \left(\Delta\Sigma_{\text{cons}} - \frac{3g^2}{8\pi^2} \Delta g \right) \quad (16)$$

The scale dependence of Δg shows that the *canonical* basis for supposing it to be gluonic spin is destroyed by renormalization. We emphasize that the results of this paper do not depend on assumptions about $E(g)$ or Δg .

So, returning to (11), we arrive at a conclusion which is now essentially conventional: the three-flavour singlet Ellis-Jaffe moment (11) at $Q \sim \infty$ tends to a singlet axial charge $g_A^0|_{\text{inv}}$ which is both gauge and scale invariant, as any measurable quantity should be. Its current experimental value is [21, 22]

$$g_A^0|_{\text{inv}} = 0.28 \pm 0.07 \quad (17)$$

Other notations for this quantity are Σ_{inv} [8] and $\Delta\Sigma(\infty)$ [11].

Now let us consider whether [23] this deep-inelastic version of the singlet axial charge is relevant for elastic Z^0 -exchange reactions. Once again, we will consider the heavy-quark limit (3), in this case, applied to the axial-vector neutral current

$$J_{\mu 5}^Z = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \sum_{q=u,c,t} - \sum_{q=d,s,b} \right\} \bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q \quad (18)$$

⁷This point has been rediscovered several times. Again, the essence of it is in Adler’s original paper [4], being connected with non-renormalization of the anomalous constant. The minor changes needed for QCD were discussed in the review [15]. See the reviews[11, 13] for recent discussions of this point in the context of proton “spin”.

⁸This reflects the well-known fact that the ratio of the moment (11) at $Q = \infty$ to that at low Q is non-perturbative. Our point here is that we will be able to relate deep inelastic scattering to elastic Z^0 exchange *despite* the presence of such a factor.

coupled to the proton.

Originally, Collins et al. [1] estimated residual effects from anomaly-cancelling pairs (t, b) , (c, s) , ... in (18). Later Kaplan and Manohar [2] considered how to extend the method to the more realistic case where c is heavy and s is light. The procedure adopted in these papers was to set a renormalization scale μ_{int} between each quark made heavy and the next in line. This approach belongs to the class of mass-dependent renormalization schemes in which decoupling theorems [25] are most easily proven. Comparisons with mass-independent schemes, where decoupling is not manifest, were the subject of much discussion many years ago [26, 27].

However, mass-independent schemes are preferable when one wants to develop explicit asymptotic expansions in $1/m_h$. For example, Chetyrkin and Kühn [7], commenting on the result of [1], observed that the renormalization prescription of amplitudes in the residual theory produced by a heavy-quark limit is hard to determine in a mass-dependent renormalization scheme. It is much simpler to have asymptotic results depending on just one scale parameter μ and not on the residual quark masses.

So we choose to work in a mass-independent scheme, choosing μ such that it is suitable for the final residual theory with just three flavours, and relying on the renormalization group to keep track of all factors. This means that we consider μ to be well below m_c , as in the case of deep inelastic scattering.

Let $\mathcal{A}_6$ be an amplitude in the full six-flavour theory. Its expansion in the inverse top mass m_t^{-1} looks like an operator-product expansion in momentum space, but with Q replaced by m_t . The result involves six-flavour coefficient functions $\mathcal{C}_{n6}(m_t)$ which multiply five-flavour amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_{n5}$:

$$\mathcal{A}_6 \sim \sum_n \mathcal{C}_{n6}(m_t) \mathcal{A}_{n5} \ , \quad m_t \rightarrow \infty \quad (19)$$

Since all $\mathcal{C}_{n6}(m_t)$ are obtained at $m_t \sim \infty$, they correspond to sub-amplitudes in which all light-quark ($q \neq t$) and gluon propagators carry loop momenta $O(m_t)$. This means that, provided the renormalization scheme is mass-independent, these coefficient functions do not depend on m_b or lighter quark masses.

Consequently, the heavy- b expansion can be obtained by expanding each five-flavour amplitude $\mathcal{A}_{n5}$ in (19) in terms of five-flavour coefficient functions $\mathcal{C}_{nn'5}$ and four-flavour amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_{nn'4}$,

$$\mathcal{A}_{n5} = \sum_{n'} \mathcal{C}_{nn'5}(m_b) \mathcal{A}_{nn'4} \ , \quad m_b \rightarrow \infty \quad (20)$$

and substituting back into (19). The limit sequence can be continued by then expanding $\mathcal{A}_{nn'4}$ in m_c^{-1} , but no further, since c is the lightest quark which can conceivably be treated as heavy.

The full expansion of the original amplitude (19) is thus

$$\mathcal{A}_6 \sim \sum_{nn'n''} \mathcal{C}_{n6}(m_t) \mathcal{C}_{nn'5}(m_b) \mathcal{C}_{nn'n''4}(m_c) \mathcal{A}_{nn'n''3} \ , \quad m_t \gg m_b \gg m_c \gg \mu \quad (21)$$

It involves non-perturbative three-flavour amplitudes $\mathcal{A}_{nn'n''3}$ which we would like to relate to quantities such as $g_A^0|_{\text{inv}}$.

Let the six-flavour amplitude (19) be the proton matrix element of the neutral current (18):

$$\mathcal{A}_6 = \langle p, s | J_{\mu 5}^Z | p, s \rangle \quad (22)$$

It is well known that $J_{\mu 5}^Z$ has a soft divergence and so is renormalization-scale invariant in the full six-flavour theory. Consequently, the amplitude (22) is scale invariant, as is required for a measurable quantity. For any heavy-quark limit, it must remain measurable and scale invariant in the *residual* theory with fewer flavours.

First we consider terms in (21) which survive the limiting procedure; logarithmic corrections will be considered later. The residual theory has three flavours, so flavour SU(3) should be used to classify operators in the expansion of $J_{\mu 5}^Z$. The only possibilities are the octet operators

$$J_{\mu 5}^a = \frac{1}{2} \bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \lambda^a q \quad (23)$$

and the singlet operator (2), or better, the scale invariant operator $\mathcal{S}_\mu$ defined in (9), since we know that the answer must be scale invariant. Clearly, the terms $q = u, d$ in (18) give $J_{\mu 5}^3$, the term $q = s$ can be split into $-J_{\mu 5}^8/\sqrt{3}$ and something proportional to $\mathcal{S}_\mu$, while the terms $q = t, b, c$ contribute to $\mathcal{S}_\mu$ only:

$$J_{\mu 5}^Z \longrightarrow \text{octet} + \{\text{constant}\} \mathcal{S}_\mu \quad (24)$$

By construction, the constant of proportionality in (24) is scale invariant. It is also quark-mass independent, since we use a mass-independent renormalization scheme, so it must be independent of the gluon coupling constant g . Therefore we can evaluate it by considering the limit $g \rightarrow 0$ for $J_{\mu 5}^Z$ coupled to off-shell u, d, s quarks and noting that $E(0) = 1$:

$$\text{constant} = -\frac{1}{6} \quad (25)$$

We conclude that, in the strict heavy-quark limit (3), the neutral current is given by

$$J_{\mu 5}^Z \longrightarrow J_{\mu 5}^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} J_{\mu 5}^8 - \frac{1}{6} \mathcal{S}_\mu \quad (26)$$

Consequently, there is a precise relation between the three-flavour Ellis-Jaffe moment (11) and the neutral current amplitude (22) in the limit (4),

$$\langle p, s | J_{\mu 5}^Z | p, s \rangle \longrightarrow 2m_p s_\mu \left(g_A^{(3)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} g_A^{(8)} - \frac{1}{6} g_A^0 \Big|_{\text{inv}} \right) \quad (27)$$

where $g_A^{(a)}$ are the usual octet axial charges

$$\langle p, s | J_{\mu 5}^a | p, s \rangle = 2m_p s_\mu g_A^{(a)}, \quad a = 3, 8 \quad (28)$$

(so g_A/g_V for neutron decay equals $2g_A^3$). Note that (27) holds despite the presence of $E(g)$. The matching condition (25) at $g = 0$ is crucial in arriving at this otherwise conventional conclusion. It can be made to look even more conventional,

$$\langle p, s | J_{\mu 5}^Z | p, s \rangle \longrightarrow (2m_p s_\mu) \frac{1}{2} (\Delta u_{\text{inv}} - \Delta d_{\text{inv}} - \Delta s_{\text{inv}}) \quad (29)$$

if we define scale invariant axial charges $\Delta_{q_{\text{inv}}}$ for $q = u, d, s$ via the prescription

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Delta_{u_{\text{inv}}} \\ \Delta_{d_{\text{inv}}} \\ \Delta_{s_{\text{inv}}} \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 3 & \sqrt{3} & 1 \\ -3 & \sqrt{3} & 1 \\ 0 & -2\sqrt{3} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} g_A^{(3)} \\ g_A^{(8)} \\ g_A^0|_{\text{inv}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (30)$$

Apart from its strong dependence on the heavy-quark limit, the relation between (11) and (27) is an isoscalar version of Bjorken's sum rule [24],

The next step is to determine the leading $O(1/\log m_h)$ corrections to (27).

Let us retain only the leading power in the general expansion (19). If we arrange that each independent five-flavour amplitude $\mathcal{A}_5$ remaining on the right-hand side is scale invariant, the result necessarily consists of one or more expressions of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_6 \sim \mathcal{A}_5 \sum_{\ell \geq 0} C_{\ell 6} \bar{g}_6^{2\ell}(m_t) + \dots \quad (31)$$

where $\bar{g}_6$ is the effective gluon coupling in the six-flavour theory and the coefficients $C_{\ell 6}$ can be calculated perturbatively. Proceeding as before, we find that the leading power of (21) consists of one or more terms

$$\mathcal{A}_6 \sim \mathcal{A}_3 \sum_{\ell, \ell', \ell'' \geq 0} C_{\ell 6} C_{\ell' 5} C_{\ell'' 4} \bar{g}_6^{2\ell}(m_t) \bar{g}_5^{2\ell'}(m_b) \bar{g}_4^{2\ell''}(m_c) + \dots \quad (32)$$

involving the effective gluon couplings $\bar{g}_f$ for f flavours as functions of m_t, m_b, m_c for $f = 6, 5, 4$ respectively. (In this notation, the effective coupling $\bar{g}$ in (11) would be written $\bar{g}_3(Q)$.)

Suppose that, at a given stage of the calculation, f flavours remain, and h is the next quark to be made heavy. As noted by Collins et al. [1], the $O(1/\log m_h)$ correction arises because the current $\bar{h}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h$ in $J_{\mu 5}^Z$ can be part of a triangle sub-diagram formed from h -quark propagators. For m_h large, $\bar{h}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h$ mixes with the operator $\sum_{q \neq h} \bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 q$. We need the scale-invariant versions of these currents contained in the column vector

$$\mathcal{V}_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{h}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h \\ \sum_{q \neq h} \bar{q}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 q \end{pmatrix}_{\text{inv}} = \begin{pmatrix} f^{-1} & -1 \\ 1 - f^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \{\mathcal{S}_\mu\}_f \\ \{Y_{\mu 5}\}_f \end{pmatrix} \quad (33)$$

where the equations

$$\{\mathcal{S}_\mu\}_f = \{E(g)\}_f \left(\sum_{i=1}^f \bar{q}_i \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q_i \right)_{GI} \quad (34)$$

$$\{Y_{\mu 5}\}_f = f^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^f \bar{q}_i \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q_i - \bar{h} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 h \quad (35)$$

define f -flavour analogues of (9) and the axial-vector hypercharge current. Note that the currents in $\mathcal{V}_\mu$ are normalized such that at $g = 0$, they reduce to the usual free-field expressions.

Let $\vec{\gamma}(g)$ be the matrix Callan-Symanzik function controlling the mixing of $\mathcal{V}_\mu$ components as m_h becomes large. At $m_h = \infty$, the lower component of $\mathcal{V}_\mu$ tends

to $\{\mathcal{S}_\mu\}_{f-1}$, which is the analogue of (34) in $(f-1)$ -flavour theory. Therefore the entire leading power⁹ is given by

$$\mathcal{V}_\mu = \mathcal{P}\left\{\exp\int_0^{\bar{g}(m_h)} dg' \frac{\vec{\gamma}(g')}{\beta(g')}\right\}_f \left(\frac{\{\bar{h}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h\}_{\text{inv}}}{\{\mathcal{S}_\mu\}_{f-1}}\right)_{m_h=\infty} + O(m_h^{-1}) \quad (36)$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ denotes ordering of the exponential.

Our interest is in the upper off-diagonal term $g^4/16\pi^4 + O(g^6)$ in $\vec{\gamma}$ combined with $-g^3(33-2f)/48\pi^2 + O(g^5)$ for the f -flavour β function (for three colours). Substituting these expressions in (36), we deduce our most interesting result, *viz.* the rule

$$\{\bar{h}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 h\}_{\text{inv}} = -\frac{3\bar{g}_f^2(m_h)}{2\pi^2(33-2f)}\{\mathcal{S}_\mu\}_{f-1} + O(\{\log(m_h)\}^{-2}) \quad (37)$$

for the leading $O(1/\log m_h)$ correction. This analytic result is the first of a series of perturbative calculations which can now be done to determine various coefficients in (32). The techniques resemble those used to obtain $O(1/\log Q)$ expansions such as (11).

We should note that Chetyrkin and Kühn [7] come very close to stating this rule, but they differ on a detail in the flavour dependence. This becomes clear when successive heavy-quark limits are considered. Following [1], they considered $m_t \rightarrow \infty$ and then $m_b \rightarrow \infty$ for the difference $\bar{t}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 t - \bar{b}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 b$ and found a *five*-flavour expression

$$\frac{3}{23}(\bar{g}_5^2(m_b) - \bar{g}_5^2(m_t))/2\pi^2$$

for the coefficient of the four-flavour singlet current. Our rule requires a *six*-flavour dependence for the $O(1/\log m_t)$ term, $f=5$ being relevant only for the $O(1/\log m_b)$ term:

$$\bar{t}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 t - \bar{b}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 b \sim \left(\frac{3}{23}\bar{g}_5^2(m_b) - \frac{1}{7}\bar{g}_6^2(m_t)\right)\frac{1}{2\pi^2}\{\mathcal{S}_\mu\}_4 \quad (38)$$

It is not clear whether the result of Collins et al. [1] is consistent with (38) or not. Their formula contains only one running coupling $\bar{g}$ evaluated at both m_t and m_b , so the flavour dependence does not appear to be the same. However, their renormalization scheme is mass dependent (unlike ours), producing amplitudes in the residual theory with renormalization prescriptions which are hard to specify [7]. Comparisons with the work of Kaplan and Manohar [2, 28], in which the mass-dependent approach of [1] is taken much further, are correspondingly more difficult to make.

In the limit (3), the rule (37) applied to the neutral current implies

$$J_{\mu 5}^Z = J_{\mu 5}^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}J_{\mu 5}^8 - \mathcal{C}(m_h)\mathcal{S}_\mu + O(1/m_h) \quad (39)$$

where the coefficient $\mathcal{C}$ (including the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ in (18)) is

$$\mathcal{C} = \frac{1}{6} + \frac{3}{4\pi^2}\left(\frac{1}{21}\bar{g}_6^2(m_t) - \frac{1}{23}\bar{g}_5^2(m_b) + \frac{1}{25}\bar{g}_4^2(m_c)\right) + O(\{\log(m_h)\}^{-2}) \quad (40)$$

⁹Strictly speaking, we should replace the renormalized parameter m_h by the scale invariant quantity $\kappa m_h \{\exp - \int_0^g \gamma_m(g')/\beta(g')\}_f$ in all asymptotic equations, where $\gamma_m(g)$ is the Callan-Symanzik function for mass renormalization in the f -flavour theory, and κ is a number to be determined from the finite part of the two-loop calculation at $m_h = \infty$. This does not affect $O(1/\log m_h)$ corrections.

This coefficient fixes the first logarithmic correction for the amplitude (27):

$$\langle p, s | J_{\mu 5}^Z | p, s \rangle = 2m_p s_\mu \left(g_A^{(3)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} g_A^{(8)} - \mathcal{C}(m_h) g_A^0 \Big|_{\text{inv}} \right) + O(1/m_h) \quad (41)$$

As in (25), normalizations can be checked via matching conditions at $g \sim 0$ at any point in the derivation.

A numerical estimate of the corrections in $\mathcal{C}$ can be obtained by substituting

$$\bar{g}_f^2 \sim \frac{24\pi^2}{33 - 2f} \{\log(m_h/\mu)\}^{-1} \quad (42)$$

with the scale μ chosen well below m_c but in the range of a few to several hundred MeV characteristic of low-energy strong interactions. Let us take $\mu = 0.5$ GeV. Then, listing contributions in the order $h = t, b, c$, we find

$$\mathcal{C} \approx \frac{1}{6}(1 + 0.04 - 0.09 + 0.15) = \frac{1}{6}(1.11) \quad (43)$$

The correction is almost three times that of [2] and opposite in sign. It corrects Δs_{inv} by an amount 0.01 compared with the experimental value [21, 22] -0.11 ± 0.03 for inelastic processes.

The rule (37) can also be used to compare the Ellis-Jaffe moment (11) below charm threshold, as defined by the limiting procedure (4), and the corresponding quantity $\int_0^1 dx g_1^c(x, Q^2)$ well above threshold, where asymptotia is defined by the condition (5). Note that c is still considered heavy, not light (since flavour $SU(4)$ symmetry is a very bad approximation compared with $m_c \gg \mu$). Going from (4) to (5), we have to replace the three-flavour singlet operator $\mathcal{S}_\mu$ by the four-flavour expression

$$\left\{ \sum_{q \neq c} \bar{q} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 q + 2 \bar{c} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 c \right\}_{\text{inv}} \quad (44)$$

Consequently, as m_c becomes large, the rule (37) predicts

$$\int_0^1 dx \left(g_1^c(x, \infty) - g_1(x, \infty) \right) \sim -\frac{3}{25\pi^2} \bar{g}_4^2(m_c) \frac{1}{9} g_A^0 \Big|_{\text{inv}} \approx \frac{1}{9} g_A^0 \Big|_{\text{inv}} (-0.10) \quad (45)$$

where $g_A^0|_{\text{inv}}$ is the three-flavour singlet axial charge (10) appearing in (11) and (41). The minus sign in (45) indicates that charm production is slightly enhanced when the beam and target spins are aligned.

A previous estimate [29] of (45) was obtained by evolving the moment through the charm threshold. This involves a specific model for threshold behaviour for scale-dependent amplitudes in a mass-dependent renormalization prescription, so a theoretical or numerical comparison with our result is not obvious. Throughout, we avoid thresholds and use a mass-independent prescription; that leads to explicit results for $O(1/\log m_h)$ corrections.

Acknowledgements

Support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (SDB and AWT), the Australian Research Council (AWT), and CAPES Brazil (FMS) is gratefully acknowledged. FMS and AWT thank the Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington for its hospitality and the U.S. Department of Energy for partial

support at the beginning of this work. RJC thanks Peter Minkowski for helpful discussions, and Dieter Schütte for his hospitality at the Institute for Theoretical Nuclear Physics, University of Bonn, where the manuscript was completed.

References

- [1] J. Collins, F. Wilczek and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. D 18 (1978) 242.
- [2] D.B. Kaplan and A.V. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B 310 (1988) 527.
- [3] J. Kodaira, Nucl. Phys. B 165 (1980) 129.
- [4] S.L. Adler, Phys. Rev. 177 (1969) 2426.
- [5] J.S. Bell and R. Jackiw, Nuovo Cimento 60 A (1969) 47.
- [6] P. Minkowski, in Proc. Workshop on *Effective Field Theories of the Standard Model*, Dobogókő, Hungary 1991, ed. U.-G. Meissner (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
- [7] K.G. Chetyrkin and J.H. Kühn, Z. Phys. C 60 (1993) 497.
- [8] S.A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B 334 (1994) 192.
- [9] A. Donnachie and P.V. Landshoff, Z. Phys. C 61 (1994) 139.
- [10] J. Ellis and R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. D 9 (1974) 1444; (E) D 10 (1974) 1669;
R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Lett. B 193 (1987) 101.
- [11] G. Altarelli and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 39 B,C (1995) 106.
- [12] G. Grunberg, Phys. Lett. B 388 (1996) 173.
- [13] H.-Y. Cheng, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 11 (1996) 5109.
- [14] R. Köberle and N.K. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. D 8 (1973) 660;
R.J. Crewther, S.-S. Shei and T.-M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D 8 (1973) 3396;
R.J. Crewther and N.K. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B 87 (1975) 52.
- [15] R.J. Crewther, Effects of Topological Charge in Gauge Theories, in Facts and Prospects of Gauge Theories, Schladming, Austria, February 1978, ed. P. Urban, Acta Physica Austriaca Suppl. 19 (1978) 47, section 7.
- [16] M.A.B. Bég, Phys. Rev. D 11 (1975) 1165.
- [17] R.P. Feynman, M. Gell-Mann, and G. Zweig, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13 (1964) 678.
- [18] C.S. Lam and B.-A. Li, Phys. Rev. D 25 (1982) 683;
P. Ratcliffe, Nucl. Phys. B 223 (1983) 45.

- [19] A.V. Efremov and O.V. Teryaev, JINR Report E2-88-287 (1988), and in Proceedings of the International Hadron Symposium, Bechyně 1988, eds. J. Fischer et al. (Czechoslovakian Academy of Science, Prague, 1989) p. 302;
G. Altarelli and G.G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B 212 (1988) 391;
R.D. Carlitz, J.C. Collins, and A.H. Mueller, Phys. Lett. B 214 (1988) 229.
- [20] R.L. Jaffe and A. Manohar, Nucl. Phys. B 337 (1990) 509;
R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Lett. B 365 (1996) 359.
- [21] EMC Collaboration, J Ashman et al., Phys. Lett. B 206 (1988) 364; Nucl. Phys. B 328 (1989) 1;
SMC Collaboration, D. Adams et al., Phys. Lett. B 329 (1994) 399; (E) B 339 (1994) 332
E143 Collaboration, K. Abe et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 346.
- [22] B. Badelek, CRAD96 conference, Cracow, August 1996 (hep-ph/9612274).
- [23] S.D. Bass and A.W. Thomas, Phys. Lett. B 293 (1992) 457.
- [24] J.D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. 148 (1966) 1467; Phys. Rev. D 1 (1970) 1376.
- [25] K. Symanzik, Commun. Math. Phys. 34 (1973) 7;
T. Appelquist and J. Carazzone, Phys. Rev. D 11 (1975) 2856.
- [26] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 104 (1976) 445.
- [27] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. B 91 (1980) 51;
B.A. Ovrut and H.J. Schnitzer, Phys. Rev. D 21 (1980) 3369; Nucl. Phys. B 179 (1981) 381;
W. Bernreuther and W. Wetzel, B 197 (1982) 228;
W. Bernreuther, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 151 (1983) 127;
W. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D 29 (1984) 580.
- [28] A.V. Manohar, Phys. Lett. B 242 (1990) 94.
- [29] G. Altarelli and B. Lampe, Z. Phys. C 47 (1990) 315.